

The Progenitors of Type Ia Supernovae

By MARIO LIVIO

Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218

Models for Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) are reviewed. It is shown that there are strong reasons to believe that SNe Ia represent thermonuclear disruptions of C–O white dwarfs, when these white dwarfs reach the Chandrasekhar limit and ignite carbon at their centers.

Progenitor scenarios are reviewed critically and the strengths and weaknesses of each scenario are explicitly presented. It is argued that single-degenerate models, in which the white dwarf accretes from a subgiant or giant companion are currently favored. The relation of the different models to the use of SNe Ia for the determination of cosmological parameters is also discussed.

Observational tests of the conclusions are suggested.

1. Introduction

During the past year two groups have presented strong evidence that the expansion of the universe is accelerating rather than decelerating (Perlmutter et al. 1998, 1999; Schmidt et al. 1998; Riess et al. 1998). This surprising result comes from distance measurements to about fifty supernovae Type Ia in the redshift range $z = 0$ to $z = 1$. The results are consistent with the cosmological constant (or vacuum energy) contributing to the total energy density about 70% of the critical density.

This unexpected finding, as well as the use of supernovae Type Ia to measure the Hubble constant (e.g. Sandage et al. 1996; Saha et al. 1997), has focused the attention again on the frustrating fact that in spite of decades of research the exact nature of the progenitors of supernovae Type Ia remains unknown. Until this problem is solved, one cannot be fully confident that supernovae at higher redshifts are not somehow different from their low redshift counterparts. In the present review I therefore examine critically the question of the nature of the progenitors of supernovae Type Ia. Other recent reviews include Branch et al. (1995), Livio (1996a), Renzini (1996) and Iben (1997).

2. Characteristics and the basic model

The *defining* characteristics of supernovae Type Ia (SNe Ia) are both spectral: (i) the *lack* of lines of hydrogen, and (ii) the *presence* of a strong red Si II absorption feature ($\lambda 6355$ shifted to ~ 6100 Å).

Once defined as SNe Ia, the following are several of the important *observational characteristics* of the class which may help in the search for progenitors:

(1) *Homogeneity*: Nearly 90% of all SNe Ia form a homogeneous class in terms of their *spectra*, *light curves*, and *peak absolute magnitudes*. The latter are given by

$$M_B \simeq M_V \simeq -19.30(\pm 0.03) + 5 \log(H_0/60 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}) \quad (2.1)$$

with a dispersion of $\sigma(M_B) \sim \sigma(M_V) \sim 0.2\text{--}0.3$ (Hamuy et al. 1996a; Tamman & Sandage 1995; and see Branch 1998 for a review).

(2) *Inhomogeneity*: Some differences in the spectra and light curves do exist (e.g. Hamuy et al. 1996b). In terms of explosion strength, SNe Ia can roughly be ordered as follows: SN 1991bg and SN 1992K represent the weakest events, followed by weak events like 1986G, followed by about 90% of all SNe Ia which are called “normals” (or “Branch normals”), to the stronger than normal events like SN 1991T.

(3) The *luminosity function* of SNe Ia declines very steeply on the bright side (e.g. Vaughan et al. 1995). Since selection effects cannot prevent the discovery of SNe which are brighter than the “normals,” this implies that *the normals are essentially the brightest*.

(4) Near maximum light, the spectra are characterized by *high velocity* (8000–30,000 km s⁻¹) *intermediate mass elements* (O–Ca). In the late, nebular phase, the spectra are dominated by forbidden lines of iron (e.g. Kirshner et al. 1993; Wheeler et al. 1995; Ruiz-Lapuente et al. 1995; Gómez et al. 1996; Filippenko 1997).

(5) Fairly young populations appear to be most efficient at producing SNe Ia (e.g. they tend to be associated with spiral arms in spirals; Della Valle & Livio 1994; Bartunov, Tsvetkov & Filimonova 1994), but relatively old populations ($\tau \gtrsim 4 \times 10^9$ yr) can also produce them. In particular, *SNe Ia do occur in ellipticals* (e.g. Turatto, Cappellaro & Benetti 1994). This immediately implies that *SNe Ia are not caused by the core collapse of stars more massive than $8 M_{\odot}$* .

(6) There exist a number of correlations between different pairs of observables (see e.g. Branch 1998 for a review). Of these, the most frequently used in the context of determinations of cosmological parameters is the correlation between the *absolute magnitude and the shape of the light curve*. Basically, brighter SNe Ia decline more slowly. The parameter commonly used to quantify the light curve shape is Δm_{15} (Phillips 1993), the decline in magnitudes in the *B* band during the first 15 days after maximum light. Hamuy et al. (1996a) find slopes $dM_B/d\Delta m_{15} = 0.78 \pm 0.17$, $dM_V/d\Delta m_{15} = 0.71 \pm 0.14$, and $dM_I/d\Delta m_{15} = 0.58 \pm 0.13$. Using a stretch-factor s (Perlmutter et al. 1997), one can write $M_B = M_B(s=1) - \alpha * (s-1)$, with $M_B(s=1) = -19.46$ (e.g. Sandage et al. 1996), and $\alpha = 1.74$ (Perlmutter et al. 1999). Sophisticated techniques for using the different correlations in distance determinations have been developed (e.g. Riess et al. 1996, 1998).

The above characteristics can be augmented with the following suggestive facts:

(1) The *energy* per unit mass, $1/2(\sim 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1})^2$, is of the order of the one obtained from the conversion of carbon and oxygen to iron.

(2) The fact that the event is explosive suggests that *degeneracy* may play a role.

(3) The spectrum contains no hydrogen.

(4) The explosions can occur with long delays, after the cessation of star formation.

All the properties above have led to one agreed upon model: *SNe Ia represent thermonuclear disruptions of mass accreting white dwarfs*.

It is interesting that there exists a unanimous consensus on this model in spite of the fact that the essence of flame physics and the details of the transition from deflagration to detonation (in particular the density at which the transition occurs), which are at the heart of the model, remain as major unsolved problems (e.g. Khokhlov, Oran & Wheeler 1997; Woosley 1997; Reinecke, Hillebrandt & Niemeyer 1998; and talks by Khokhlov, Arnett, and Hillebrandt presented at the Chicago meeting on Type Ia Supernovae: Theory and Cosmology, October 1998). In fact, given these uncertainties in the deflagration to detonation transition it is almost difficult to understand how the entire family of SNe Ia light curves can be fitted essentially with one parameter (e.g. Perlmutter et al. 1997), although it is possible that all SNe Ia explode at the same WD mass (see §4), and that the entire observed diversity stems from different ⁵⁶Ni masses.

3. Why is identifying the progenitors important?

The fact that we do not know yet what are the progenitor systems of some of the most dramatic explosions in the universe has become a major embarrassment and one of

the key unsolved problems in stellar evolution. There are several important reasons why identifying the progenitors has become more crucial than ever:

- (i) The use of SNe Ia as one of the main ways to determine the key cosmological parameters H_0 , and the contribution to the energy density Ω_M , Ω_Λ requires an understanding of the evolution of the luminosity, and the SN rate with cosmic epoch. Both of these depend on the nature of the progenitors.
- (ii) Galaxy evolution depends on the radiative, kinetic energy, and nucleosynthetic output of SNe Ia (e.g. Kauffmann, White & Guiderdoni 1993).
- (iii) Due to the uncertainties that still exist in the explosion mechanism itself, a knowledge of the initial conditions and of the distribution of matter in the environment of the exploding star are essential for the understanding of the explosion.
- (iv) An unambiguous identification of the progenitors, coupled with observationally determined SNe Ia rates will help to place meaningful constraints on the theory of binary star evolution (e.g. Livio 1996b; Li & van den Heuvel 1997; Yungelson & Livio 1998; Hachisu, Kato & Nomoto 1999). In particular, a semi-empirical determination of the elusive common-envelope efficiency parameter, α_{CE} , may be possible (e.g. Iben & Livio 1993).

4. Refinements of the basic model

The basic model for SNe Ia (that essentially all researchers in the field agree upon) is that of a thermonuclear disruption of an accreting white dwarf (WD). However, additional refinements to the model are possible on the basis of existing observational data and theoretical models. These refinements still do not involve the question of the *progenitor systems*. Rather, they address the question of the WD *composition*, and of its *mass* at the instant of explosion.

4.1. *The composition of the exploding WD*

In principle, the WD that accretes to the point of explosion could be composed of He, of C–O, or of O–Ne. Let us examine these possibilities one by one.

(i) *He WDs*: Helium WDs have typical masses that are smaller than $\sim 0.45 M_\odot$ (e.g. Iben & Tutukov 1985). While if accreting, these He WDs can explode following central He ignition at $\sim 0.7 M_\odot$, the composition of the ejected matter in this case will be that of He, ^{56}Ni and decay products (e.g. Nomoto & Sugimoto 1977; Woosley, Taam & Weaver 1986). This is entirely inconsistent with observations (observational characteristic (4) in §2). Therefore, *He WDs certainly do not produce the bulk of SNe Ia*.

(ii) *O–Ne WDs*: Oxygen–Neon WDs form in binaries from main sequence stars of $\sim 10 M_\odot$, although the precise range which allows formation is somewhat uncertain (e.g. Iben & Tutukov 1985; Canal, Isern & Labay 1990; Dominguez, Tornambé & Isern 1993). These systems are probably not numerous enough to constitute the main channel of SNe Ia (e.g. Livio & Truran 1992). It is also generally expected that O–Ne WDs that manage to accrete enough material to reach the Chandrasekhar limit will produce preferentially accretion-induced collapses (to form neutron stars) rather than SNe Ia (e.g. Nomoto & Kondo 1991; Gutierrez et al. 1996). I should note that the existing calculations have been performed for WDs of O–Ne–Mg composition, while recent calculations of the evolution of a $10 M_\odot$ star produce degenerate cores which are almost devoid of magnesium (Ritossa, Garcia-Berro & Iben 1996). Nevertheless, because of the above two points *it is unlikely that O–Ne WDs produce the bulk of SNe Ia*.

(iii) *C–O WDs*: Carbon–Oxygen WDs are formed in binaries from main sequence stars of up to $\sim 10 M_\odot$. They are therefore both relatively numerous, and they provide a

significant “phase space volume” (masses in the range $0.8\text{--}1.2\text{ M}_{\odot}$; accretion rates in the range $10^{-8}\text{--}10^{-6}\text{ M}_{\odot}/\text{yr}$) in which they are expected to produce SNe Ia (upon reaching the Chandrasekhar limit; e.g. Nomoto & Kondo 1991). Consequently, *the accreting WDs that produce most of the SNe Ia are very probably of C–O composition!*

4.2. *At what mass does the WD explode and where and in what fuel does the ignition take place?*

While there is virtually unanimous agreement about everything I said up to now, namely, that: *SNe Ia are thermonuclear disruptions of accreting C–O WDs*, the next step in the refinement of the model is more controversial. Two major classes of models have been considered, and they suggest entirely different answers to the questions posed by the title of this subsection. In one class, the WD explodes upon reaching the *Chandrasekhar mass*, as *carbon* ignites at its *center*. In the second, the WD explodes at a *sub-Chandrasekhar mass*, as *helium* ignites *off-center*. I will now review briefly each of these classes and point out its strengths and weaknesses.

4.2.1. *Chandrasekhar mass carbon ignitors*

In this model, considered ‘standard,’ the WD accretes until it approaches the Chandrasekhar mass. Carbon ignition occurs at or very near the center and the burning front propagates outwards. The main *strengths* of this model are (see e.g. Hoefflich & Khokhlov 1996; Nugent et al. 1997 for detailed modeling):

- (1) Some 10^{51} *ergs of kinetic energy* are deposited into the ejecta by nuclear energy.
- (2) ^{56}Ni decay powers the *lightcurve*.
- (3) The density and composition as a function of the ejection of velocity ($X_i(V_{\text{ej}})$) are consistent with the observed *spectra*.
- (4) The fact that the explosion occurs at the Chandrasekhar mass explains the *homogeneity*.
- (5) Spectra (e.g. of SNe 1994D, 1992A) can be fitted in great detail by theoretical models (e.g. Nugent et al. 1997).

The main *weaknesses* of the Chandrasekhar mass models are:

- (1) It has proven more difficult than originally thought for WDs to accrete *up to the Chandrasekhar mass* in sufficient numbers to account for the SNe Ia rate. The difficulty is associated with mass loss episodes in nova explosions, in helium shell flashes and in massive winds or common envelope phases. I will return to some of these problems when I discuss specific progenitor models.
- (2) For initial WD masses larger than $\sim 1.2\text{ M}_{\odot}$, *accretion-induced collapse* is a more likely outcome than a SN Ia (e.g. Nomoto & Kondo 1991).
- (3) *The late-time spectrum* (~ 300 days), and in particular the Fe III feature at $\sim 4700\text{ \AA}$ does not agree well with Chandrasekhar mass models (Liu, Jeffrey & Schultz 1998).

My overall assessment of Chandrasekhar mass models is that the strengths significantly outweigh the weaknesses. The calculation of late-time, nebular spectra involves many uncertainties, and hence I do not regard weakness (3) above as fatal (although clearly more work will be required to explain it away). Both weaknesses (1) and (2) can be overcome if it can be demonstrated that SNe Ia statistics can be reproduced within the uncertainties that still plague the theoretical population synthesis models. As I will show in §5, this is indeed the case.

4.2.2. Sub-Chandrasekhar mass helium ignitors

In these models a C–O WD accumulates a helium layer of $\sim 0.15 M_{\odot}$ with a total mass that is sub-Chandrasekhar. The helium ignites off-center (at the bottom of the layer), resulting in an event known as “Indirect Double Detonation” (IDD) or “Edge Lit Detonation” (ELD). Basically, one detonation propagates outward (through the helium), while an inward propagating pressure wave compresses the C–O core which ignites off-center, followed by an outward detonation (e.g. Livne 1990; Livne & Glasner 1991; Woosley & Weaver 1994; Livne & Arnett 1995; Hoefflich & Khokhlov 1996; and Ruiz-Lapuente, talk presented at the Chicago meeting on Type Ia Supernovae: Theory and Cosmology, October 1998).

The main *strengths* of ELD (sub-Chandrasekhar) models are:

- (1) It is easier to achieve the required *statistics*, since less mass needs to be accreted, and the WD does not need to be extremely massive (e.g. Ruiz-Lapuente, Canal & Burkert 1997; Di Stefano et al. 1997; Yungelson & Livio 1998).
- (2) The *late-time spectrum* (in particular the Fe III feature at $\sim 4700 \text{ \AA}$) agrees better with ELD models.
- (3) SNe Ia *light curves* can be reproduced adequately by ELD models (although the light curves rise somewhat faster than observed, due to ^{56}Ni heating; Hoefflich et al. 1997).

The main *weaknesses* of ELD models are:

- (1) The *spectra* that are produced by ELD models generally do not agree with observations (e.g. of SN 1994D; Nugent et al. 1997). The agreement is somewhat better for the subluminous SNe Ia (e.g. SN 1991bg; Nugent et al. 1997; Ruiz-Lapuente, talk presented at the Chicago meeting on Supernovae, October 1998), but even there it is not very good.
- (2) The *highest velocity ejecta have the wrong composition* (^{56}Ni and He; not intermediate mass elements; also no high velocity C; e.g. Livne & Arnett 1995). This is due to the fact that in these models, essentially by necessity, the intermediate mass elements are sandwiched by Ni and He/Ni rich layers.
- (3) Since ELD models allow for a range of WD masses, and since more massive WDs produce brighter SNe, one might expect this model to produce a more gradual decline on the bright side of the *luminosity function*, in contradiction to the observed sharp decline (see §2 characteristic (3)).

My overall assessment of the sub-Chandrasekhar mass model is that the weaknesses (and in particular weakness (2) which appears almost inevitable) greatly outweigh the strengths in terms of this being a model for the bulk of SNe Ia. It is still possible that ELDs may correctly represent some subluminous SNe Ia (e.g. Ruiz-Lapuente, Canal, & Burkert 1997). I should note that Pinto (verbal communication at the Chicago meeting on Supernovae) insists that his ELD models manage to overcome all of the above weaknesses and that they are able to produce excellent fits to both light curves and spectra. By the time of the writing of this review, however, I have unfortunately failed to find published results of these models and hence I cannot comment on them.

4.3. The favored model

On the basis of the above discussion the basic model can be further refined, and I tentatively conclude that: *SNe Ia represent thermonuclear disruptions of mass accreting C–O white dwarfs, when these white dwarfs reach the Chandrasekhar limit and ignite carbon at their centers!*

5. The two possible scenarios

The next step in the search for the progenitor systems of SNe Ia is even more controversial. Two possible scenarios have been proposed: (i) The *double-degenerate* scenario, in which two CO WDs in a binary system are brought together by the emission of gravitational radiation and coalesce (Webbink 1984; Iben & Tutukov 1984). (ii) The *single-degenerate* scenario, in which a CO WD accretes hydrogen-rich or helium-rich material from a non-degenerate companion (Whelan & Iben 1973; Nomoto 1982).

In the first scenario the progenitor systems are necessarily *binary WD systems* in which the total mass exceeds the Chandrasekhar mass, and which have binary periods shorter than about thirteen hours (to allow merger within a Hubble time).

In the second scenario the progenitors could be systems like: (i) *Recurrent novae* (both of the type in which the WD accretes hydrogen from a giant like T CrB, RS Oph and of the type in which the WD accretes helium rich material from a subgiant like U Sco, V394 CrA, and Nova LMC 1990#2), (ii) *Symbiotic Systems* (in which the WD accretes from a low mass red giant), or (iii) persistent *Supersoft X-ray Sources* (in which the WD accretes at a high rate $\gtrsim 10^{-7} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ from a subgiant companion).

I will now examine the strengths and weaknesses of each one of these scenarios.

5.1. The double-degenerate scenario

There is no question that binary white dwarf systems are an expected outcome of binary star evolution (e.g. Iben & Tutukov 1984; Iben & Livio 1993). Once the lighter WD (which has a larger radius) fills its Roche lobe, it is entirely dissipated within a few orbital periods, to form a massive disk around the primary (e.g. Rasio & Shapiro 1994). The subsequent evolution of the system depends largely on the accretion rate through this disk (e.g. Mochkovitch & Livio 1990; see discussion below).

The main *strengths* of this scenario are the following:

(1) The *absence of hydrogen* in the spectrum is naturally explained in a model which involves the merger of two C–O WDs. In fact, if hydrogen is ever detected in the spectrum of a SN Ia, this would deal a fatal blow to this model. Tentative evidence for circumstellar H α absorption in SN 1990M was presented by Polcaro and Viotti (1991). However, Della Valle, Benetti & Panagia (1996) demonstrated convincingly that the absorption was caused by the parent galaxy, rather than by the SN environment.

(2) In spite of some impressions to the contrary, *many double WD systems do exist*. In a sample of 153 field WDs and subdwarf B stars, Saffer, Livio & Yungelson (1998) found 18 new double-degenerate candidates. There are currently eight known systems with orbital periods of less than half a day. While only one of those systems (KPD 0422+5421; Koen, Orosz & Wade (1998)) has a total mass which within the errors could be higher than the Chandrasekhar mass, the sample of confirmed short-period double-degenerates is still smaller than the number predicted to contain a massive system.

(3) Population synthesis calculations predict the *right statistics* for mergers, about 10^{-3} yr^{-1} events for populations that are $\sim 10^8 \text{ yr}$ old and 10^{-4} yr^{-1} for populations that are $\sim 10^{10} \text{ yr}$ old.

(4) Since double WD systems were found to exist, *mergers* with some “interesting” consequences (either a SN Ia or an accretion-induced collapse) appear inevitable.

(5) The explosion or collapse is expected to occur at the Chandrasekhar mass, which as I noted in §4.3, I regard as a property of the favored model.

The main *weaknesses* of the double-degenerate scenario are the following:

(1) There are strong indications that WD mergers may lead to off-center carbon ignition, accompanied by the conversion of the C–O WD to an O–Ne–Mg composition, and

followed by an accretion-induced collapse rather than a SN Ia (e.g. Mochkovitch & Livio 1990; Saio & Nomoto 1985, 1998; Woosley & Weaver 1986).

(2) Galactic chemical evolution results, and in particular the behavior of the $[\text{O}/\text{Fe}]$ ratio as a function of metallicity ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$) have been claimed to be inconsistent with WD mergers as the mechanism for SNe Ia (Kobayashi et al. 1998).

Since we are now getting to the final stages in the identification of the progenitors, it is important to assess critically the severity of the above weaknesses. I will therefore discuss now each one of them in some detail.

5.1.1. *Constraints from Galactic chemical evolution*

Supernovae Type II (SNe II) are explosions resulting from the core collapse of massive ($\gtrsim 8 M_{\odot}$) stars. These supernovae produce relatively more oxygen and magnetism than iron ($[\text{O}/\text{Fe}] > 0$). On the other hand SNe Ia produce mostly iron and little oxygen. Until recently, the impression has been that metal poor stars ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq -1$) have a nearly flat relation of $[\text{O}/\text{Fe}]$ vs. $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, with a value of $[\text{O}/\text{Fe}] \sim 0.45$ (e.g. Nissen et al. 1994), while disk stars ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \gtrsim -1$) show a linearly decreasing $[\text{O}/\text{Fe}]$ with increasing metallicity (e.g. Edvardsson et al. 1993). The break near $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \sim -1$ was traditionally explained by the fact that the early heavy element production was done exclusively by SNe Ia, with the break occurring when the larger Fe production by SNe Ia kicks in (e.g. Matteucci & Greggio 1986).

Recently, Kobayashi et al. (1998) performed chemical evolution calculations for both the double-degenerate scenario and for the single-degenerate scenario. For the latter they used two types of progenitor systems: one with a red giant companion and an orbital period of tens to hundreds of days, and the other with a near main sequence companion and a period of a few tenths of a day to a few days.

They obtained for the double-degenerate scenario (for which they took a time delay of ~ 0.1 – 0.3 Gyr) a break at $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \sim -2$. For the single-degenerate scenario (with a delay caused by the main sequence lifetime of $\gtrsim 1$ Gyr; including metallicity effects), they obtained a break at $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \sim -1$. Kobayashi et al. (1998) thus concluded that the double-degenerate scenario is inconsistent with Galactic chemical evolution results.

Personally, I am not convinced by this apparent discrepancy, since Galactic chemical evolution calculations (and observations) are notoriously uncertain. In particular, the most recent Keck observations of oxygen in unevolved metal-poor stars show *no break* in the $[\text{O}/\text{Fe}]$ vs. $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ relation. Rather, oxygen is enhanced relative to iron over three orders of magnitude in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ in a robustly linear relation (Boesgaard et al. 1999). Consequently, apparent inconsistencies based on Galactic chemical evolution cannot be regarded at present as a fatal weakness of the double-degenerate scenario.

5.1.2. *SN Ia or accretion induced collapse?*

Potentially a more serious (and possibly even fatal) weakness of the double-degenerate scenario comes from the fact that some estimates and calculations indicate that the coalescence of two C–O WDs may lead to an accretion-induced collapse rather than to a SN explosion (e.g. Mochkovitch & Livio 1990; Saio & Nomoto 1985, 1998; Kawai, Saio & Nomoto 1987; Timmes, Woosley & Taam 1994).

The point is the following: once the lighter WD fills its Roche lobe, it is dissipated within a few orbital periods (Benz et al. 1990; Rasio & Shapiro 1995; Guerro 1994) and it forms a hot thick disk configuration around the more massive white dwarf. This disk is mainly rotationally supported and hence central carbon ignition does not take place immediately, but rather the subsequent evolution depends largely on the rate of angular momentum transport and removal, since they determine the accretion rate onto

the primary WD. As long as the accretion rate is higher than about $\dot{M} \gtrsim 2.7 \times 10^{-6} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, *carbon is ignited off-center* (at the core-disk boundary; this may happen during the merger itself; e.g. Segretain 1994). Under such conditions, the flame was found (in spherically symmetric calculations) to propagate all the way to the center within a few thousand years, thus burning the C–O into an O–Ne–Mg mixture with *no explosion* (i.e. before carbon is centrally ignited; e.g. Saio & Nomoto 1998). Such configurations are expected to collapse (following electron captures on ^{24}Mg) to form neutron stars (Nomoto & Kondo 1991; Canal 1997). The main questions are then:

- (i) What accretion rates can be expected from the initial WD-thick disk configuration?
- (ii) May some aspects of the flame propagation be different given the fact that the real problem is three-dimensional while most of the existing calculations were performed using a spherically symmetric code? In particular, *could the carbon burning be quenched before the transformation to O–Ne–Mg composition occurs?*

The answers to both of these questions involve uncertainties, however some possibilities are more likely than others. First, it appears *very difficult to avoid high accretion rates*. If the MHD turbulence that is expected to develop in accretion disks (e.g. Balbus & Hawley 1998) is operative, with a corresponding viscosity parameter of $\alpha \sim 0.01$ (where the viscosity is given by $\nu \sim \alpha c_s H$, with H being a vertical scaleheight in the disk and c_s the speed of sound; e.g. Balbus, Hawley & Stone 1996), then angular momentum can be removed in a matter of days! In such a case, even if the accretion rate is Eddington limited (at $\sim 10^{-5} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$), off-center carbon ignition should still occur, with an eventual collapse rather than an explosion. Deviations from spherical symmetry can only hurt, since they may allow accretion to proceed at a super-Eddington rate. It is difficult to see why the dynamo-generated viscosity would be suppressed for the kind of shear and temperatures expected in the disk.

Concerning the burning itself, recent attempts at multi-dimensional calculations of the flame propagation and a more detailed analysis of some of the processes involved (Garcia-Senz, Bravo & Serichol 1998; Bravo & Garcia-Senz 1999) indicate that if anything, accretion induced collapses are an even more likely outcome than previously thought. This is due to the effects of electron captures in Nuclear Statistical Equilibrium which tend to stabilize the thermonuclear flame, and to Coulomb corrections to the equation of state. The latter has the effect of reducing the flame velocities and the electronic and ionic pressures, all of which result in a reduction in the critical density which separates explosions from collapses.

Finally, on the observational side there are also two points which argue at some level against WD mergers as SNe Ia progenitors.

- (i) Even if MHD viscosity could somehow be suppressed, and the disk surrounding the primary WD could cool down, so that angular momentum would be transported only via the viscosity of (partially) degenerate electrons, this would result in an accretion timescale of $\sim 10^9$ yrs (Mochkovitch & Livio 1990; Mochkovitch et al. 1997). The system prior to the explosion would have an absolute magnitude of $M_V \lesssim 10$ (with much of the emission occurring in the UV). There is no evidence for the existence of some $\sim 10^7$ such objects in the Galaxy.

- (ii) The existence of planets around the pulsars PSR 1257+12 and PSR 1620–26 (Wolszczan 1997; Backer 1993; Thorsett, Arzoumanian & Taylor 1993) could be taken to mean (this is a model dependent statement) that mergers tend to produce accretion induced collapses rather than SNe Ia. In one of the leading models for the formation of such planets (Podsiadlowski; Pringle & Rees 1991; Livio, Pringle & Saffer 1992), the planets form in the following sequence of events. The lighter WD is dissipated (upon Roche lobe overflow) to form a disk around the primary. As material from this disk is accreted,

matter at the outer edge of the disk has to absorb the angular momentum, thereby expanding the disk to a large radius. The planets form from this disk in the same way that they did in the solar system, while the central object collapses to form a neutron star.

5.1.3. Overall assessment of the double-degenerate scenario

It has now been observationally demonstrated that many double-degenerate systems exist. The general agreement between the distribution of the observed properties (e.g. orbital periods, masses) and those predicted by population synthesis calculations (Saffer, Livio & Yungelson 1998), suggests that the fact that no clear candidate (short period) system with a total mass exceeding the Chandrasekhar mass has been found yet, may merely reflect the insufficient size of the observational sample. Thus, there is very little doubt in my mind that statistics is not a serious problem. The most disturbing uncertainty is related to the outcome of the merger process itself. The discussion in §5.1.2 suggests that *collapse to a neutron star is more likely than a SN Ia* (see also Mochovitch et al. 1997).

5.2. The single-degenerate scenario

The main *strengths* of the single degenerate scenario are:

(1) A class of objects in which hydrogen is being transferred at such high rates that it *burns steadily* on the surface of the WD has been identified—the Supersoft X-ray Sources (Greiner, Hasinger & Kahabka 1991; van den Heuvel et al. 1992; Southwell et al. 1996; Kahabka and van den Heuvel 1997). If the accreted matter can indeed be retained, this provides a natural path to an increase in the WD mass towards the Chandrasekhar mass (e.g. Di Stefano & Rappaport 1994; Livio 1995, 1996a; Yungelson et al. 1996).

(2) Other candidate progenitor systems are known to exist, like symbiotic systems (e.g. Munari & Renzini 1992; Kenyon et al. 1993; Hachisu, Kato & Nomoto 1999) and recurrent novae (Hachisu et al. 1999).

(3) There have been claims that the single degenerate scenario fits better the results of Galactic chemical evolution (e.g. Kobayoski et al. 1998). However, as I have shown in §5.1.1, recent observations cast doubt on this assertion. Similarly, nucleosynthesis results show that in order to avoid unacceptably large ratios of $^{54}\text{Cr}/^{56}\text{Fe}$ and $^{50}\text{Ti}/^{56}\text{Fe}$, the central density of the WD at the moment of thermonuclear runaway must be lower than $\sim 2 \times 10^9 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ (Nomoto et al. 1997). Such low densities are realized for high accretion rates ($\gtrsim 10^{-7} \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$), which are typical for the Supersoft X-ray Sources. Nucleosynthesis results suffer too, however, from considerable uncertainties (e.g. Nagataki, Hashimoto & Sato 1998).

The main *weaknesses* of the single degenerate scenario are:

(1) The upper limits on *radio detection* of hydrogen at 2 and 6 cm in SN 1986G, taken approximately one week before optical maximum (Eck et al. 1995), rule out a symbiotic system progenitor for this system with a wind mass loss rate of $10^{-7} \lesssim \dot{M}_W \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Boffi & Branch 1995). This in itself is not fatal, since SN 1986G is somewhat peculiar (e.g. Branch and van den Bergh 1993), and the upper limit on the mass loss rate is at the high end of observed symbiotic winds. An even less stringent upper limit from x-ray and $\text{H}\alpha$ observations exists for SN 1994D (Cumming et al. 1996).

(2) There exists some uncertainty whether WDs can then reach the Chandrasekhar mass *at all* by the accretion of hydrogen (e.g. Cassisi, Iben & Tornambe 1998). Furthermore, even if they can, the question of whether they can produce the required SNe Ia statistics is highly controversial (e.g. Yungelson et al. 1995, 1996; Yungelson & Livio 1998; Hachisu, Kato & Nomoto 1999; Hachisu et al. 1999).

I will now examine these weaknesses in some detail.

5.2.1. *Observational detection of hydrogen*

Ultimately, the presence or total absence of hydrogen in SNe Ia will distinguish unambiguously between single-degenerate and double-degenerate models. To date, hydrogen has not been convincingly detected in *any* SN Ia. It is interesting to note that narrow $\lambda 6300$, $\lambda 6363$ [OI] lines were observed only in one SN Ia (SN 1937C; Minkowski 1939), but even in that case there was no hint of a narrow $H\alpha$ line. Hachisu, Kato & Nomoto (1999) estimate in one of their models (which involves stripping of material from the red giant; see below) a density measure of $\dot{M}/v_{10} \sim 10^{-8} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (where v_{10} is the wind velocity in units of 10 km s^{-1}), while the most stringent radio upper limit existing currently (for SN 1986G) is $\dot{M}/v_{10} \sim 10^{-7} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Eck et al. 1995; for SN 1994D Cumming et al. (1996) find from $H\alpha$ an upper limit of $\dot{M} \sim 1.5 \times 10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for a wind speed of 10 km s^{-1} ; for SN 1992A Schlegel & Petre (1993) find from X-ray observations an upper limit of $\dot{M}/v_{10} = (2-3) \times 10^{-6} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). Thus, while it is impossible at present to rule out single-degenerate models on the basis of the apparent absence of hydrogen, the hope is that near future observations will be able to determine definitively whether this absence is real or if it merely represents the limitations of existing observations (an improvement by two orders of magnitude will give a definitive answer).

5.2.2. *Statistics*

Growing the WD to the Chandrasekhar mass is not easy. At accretion rates below $\sim 10^{-8} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ WDs undergo repeated nova outbursts (e.g. Prialnik & Kovetz 1995), in which the WDs lose more mass than they accrete between outbursts (e.g. Livio & Truran 1992). For accretion rates in the range 10^{-8} –a few $\times 10^{-7} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$, while helium can accumulate, the WDs experience mass loss due to helium shell flashes and due to the common envelope phase which results from the engulfing of the secondary star in the expanding envelope (with mass loss occurring due to drag energy deposition). At accretion rates above a few $\times 10^{-7} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$, the WDs expand to red giant configurations and lose mass due to drag in the common envelope and due to winds (e.g. Cassisi et al. 1998). The net result of this has been that population synthesis calculations which follow the evolution of all the binary systems in the Galaxy, tended until recently to conclude that single degenerate channels manage to bring WDs to the Chandrasekhar mass only at about 10% of the inferred SNe Ia frequency of $4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (e.g. Yungelson et al. 1995, 1996; Yungelson & Livio 1998; Di Stefano et al. 1997; although see Li & van den Heuvel 1997).

Very recently, a few serious attempts have been made to investigate whether the statistics could be improved by increasing the “phase space” for single degenerate scenarios, given the fact that population synthesis calculations involve many assumptions. These attempts resulted in three directions in which the phase space could be increased.

(i) The accumulation efficiency of helium has been recalculated using OPAL opacities (Kato & Hachisu 1999). These authors concluded that helium can accumulate much more efficiently than found by Cassisi et al. (1998), mainly because the latter authors used relatively low WD masses ($0.516 M_{\odot}$ and $0.8 M_{\odot}$) and old opacities in their calculations.

(ii) Hachisu et al. (1999) claimed to have identified an evolutionary channel for single-degenerate systems previously overlooked in population synthesis calculations. In this channel, the C–O WD is formed from a red giant with a helium core of 0.8 – $2.0 M_{\odot}$ (rather than from an asymptotic giant branch star with a C–O core). The immediate progenitors in this case are expected to be either helium-rich Supersoft X-ray Sources or recurrent novae of the U Sco subclass.

(iii) It has been suggested that the inclusion of a few additional physical effects, can increase substantially the phase space of the symbiotic channel (Hashisu, Kato & Nomoto 1999). These new effects included:

(1) The WD loses much of the transferred mass in a massive wind. This has the effect that the mass transfer process is stabilized for a wider range of mass ratios, up to $q_{\max} \equiv m_2/m_1 = 1.15$ instead of $q_{\max} = 0.79$ without the massive wind.

(2) It has been suggested that the wind from the WD strips the outer layers of the red giant at a high rate. This increases the allowed mass ratios (for stability) even above 1.15, essentially indefinitely.

(3) It has been suggested that at large separations (up to $\sim 30,000 R_{\odot}$) the wind from the red giant acts like a common envelope to reduce the separation, thus allowing much wider initial separations to result in interaction.

There are many uncertainties associated with all of these attempts to increase the phase space. For example, the efficiency of mass stripping from the giant by the wind from the WD may be much smaller than assumed by Hashisu et al. (1999), for the following reasons. At high accretion rates, much of the mass loss from the WD may be in the form of an outflow or a collimated jet, perpendicular to the accretion disk rather than in the direction of the giant. Evidence that this is the case is provided by the jet satellite lines to He II 4686, H β and H α observed in the Supersoft X-ray Source RX J0513.9–6951 (Southwell et al. 1996). These jet lines are very similar to those seen in the prototypical jet source SS 433 (e.g. Vermeulen et al. 1992). Furthermore, even if some of the WD wind hits the surface of the giant, it is not clear how efficient it would be in stripping mass, since the rate of energy deposition per unit area by the wind is smaller by two orders of magnitude than the giant’s own intrinsic flux.

Similarly, the efficiency of helium accumulation is still highly uncertain, as the differences between the results of Kato & Hashisu (1999) and Cassisi et al. (1998) have shown.

Finally, all the new suggestions for the increase in phase space rely very heavily on the results of the wind solutions of Kato (1990; 1991), which involve a treatment of the radiation not nearly as sophisticated as that of more state of the art radiative transfer codes (e.g. Hauschildt et al. 1995, 1996).

5.2.3. Overall assessment of the single-degenerate scenario

The above discussion suggests that probably not all the scenarios for increasing the “phase space” of the single-degenerate channels work (if they did we might have had the opposite problem of too high a frequency of SNe Ia!). However, these attempts serve to demonstrate that the input physics to population synthesis codes still involves many uncertainties. My feeling is therefore that given the many potential channels leading to SNe Ia, statistics should not be regarded as a serious problem.

Single-degenerate scenarios therefore appear quite promising, since unlike the situation a decade ago, a class of objects in which the WDs accrete hydrogen steadily (the Supersoft X-Ray Sources) has actually been identified. The main problem with single-degenerate scenarios remains the non-detection of hydrogen so far. While a difficult observational problem (see §6), the establishment of the presence or absence of hydrogen in SNe Ia should become a first priority for SNe observers.

5.3. What if...?

Given the fact that there are still uncertainties involved in identifying the SNe Ia progenitors, and that WD mergers and some form of off-center helium ignitions almost certainly occur, it is instructive to pose a few “what if” questions. For example: *What if WD*

mergers with a total mass exceeding Chandrasekhar do not produce SNe Ia, what do they produce then? The answer in this case will have to be that they almost certainly produce either neutron stars via accretion induced collapses, or single WDs, if the merger is accompanied by extensive mass loss from the system.

What if off-center helium ignitions do not produce SNe Ia? In this case, if an explosive event indeed ensues, a population of “super novae” (with $\sim 0.15 M_{\odot}$ of ^{56}Ni and He) is yet to be detected (maybe SN 1885A in M31 was such an event?). *What if off-center helium ignitions do produce SNe Ia? What comes out of the systems with $M_{\text{WD}} \gtrsim 1 M_{\odot}$, which should be even brighter?* It is difficult to believe that the latter are represented by the very few bright objects like SN 1991T. Thus, we see that off-center helium ignitions seem to present an observational problem both if they *do* and if they *do not* produce SNe Ia. To me this suggests that the physics of these events is not well understood (for example, maybe off-center helium ignition fails to ignite the C–O core after all).

6. How can we hope to identify the progenitors?

There are several ways in which observations of *nearby* supernovae could solve the mystery of SNe Ia progenitors:

(1) A combination of *early high resolution optical spectroscopy, x-ray observations and radio observations* can both provide limits on $\dot{M}/v$ from the progenitors and potentially detect the presence of circumstellar hydrogen (if it exists).

For example, narrow H I in emission or absorption could be detected either very early, or shortly after the ejecta become optically thin (~ 100 days). The latter is true because the SN ejecta probably engulfs the companion at early times (e.g. Chugai 1986; Livne, Tuchman & Wheeler 1992). The interaction of the ejecta with the circumstellar medium can be observed either in the radio (e.g. Boffi & Branch 1995) or in x-rays (e.g. Schlegel 1995). The collision of the ejecta (with circumstellar matter) can also set up a forward and a reverse shock (e.g. Chevalier 1984; Fransson, Lundqvist & Chevalier 1996), and radiation from the latter can ionize the wind and produce H α emission (e.g. Cumming et al. 1996).

(2) Early observations of the gamma-ray light curve (or gamma-ray line profiles) could distinguish between carbon ignitors and sub-Chandrasekhar helium ignitor models (see §4.2.2) since the latter can be expected to result in a quicker rise of the gamma-ray light curve due to the presence of ^{56}Ni in the outer layers (and different gamma-ray line profiles; because of the high velocity ^{56}Ni).

Observations of very distant supernovae (at $z \sim 3\text{--}4$) with the Next Generation Space Telescope (NGST) can also help (e.g. Yungelson & Livio 1999). For example, the progenitors can be identified from the observed frequency of SNe Ia as a function of redshift (e.g. Yungelson & Livio 1998, 1999; Ruiz-Lapuente & Canal 1998; Madau, Della Valle & Panagia 1998; and see §8), since different progenitor models produce different redshift distributions. Personally, I think that it would be absolutely pathetic to have to resort to this possibility. Rather, one would like to identify the progenitors independently, and to use the observations of supernovae at high z to constrain models of cosmic evolution of rates, luminosity, and input into galaxies.

7. Could we be fooled?

One of the key questions that result from the fact we do not know with certainty which systems are the progenitors of SNe Ia is clearly: *is it possible that SNe Ia at higher redshifts are systematically dimmer than their low-redshift counterparts?* In this respect

it is important to remember that a systematic decrease in the brightness by ~ 0.25 magnitudes is sufficient to explain away the need for a cosmological constant. In a recent work, Yungelson & Livio (1999) calculated the expected ratio of the rate of SNe Ia to SNe from massive stars (Types II, Ia, Ic) as a function of redshift for several progenitor models. They showed that if different progenitor systems can contribute to the total SNe Ia rate (e.g. double-degenerates at the Chandrasekhar mass and single-degenerates with subgiant donors at sub-Chandrasekhar masses), then it is possible in principle that a different progenitor class will start to dominate at $z \sim 1$. However, such a transition is highly unlikely, because: (i) in some models the transition has the opposite effect to the observed one (e.g. double degenerates which may be expected to be brighter than sub-Chandrasekhar ELDs dominate at the higher redshifts). (ii) If the contribution from physically different channels was indeed significant, one would have expected to observe this division more clearly also in the local sample, which is not the case ($\sim 90\%$ of SNe Ia are “normals”). Consequently, I do not believe that the observed universal acceleration is an artifact of the observed sample being dominated by different progenitor classes.

8. Tentative conclusions and observational tests

On the basis of the analysis and discussion in the present work, the following tentative conclusions can be drawn:

(1) SNe Ia are almost certainly thermonuclear disruptions of mass accreting *C-O white dwarfs*.

(2) It is very likely that the explosion occurs *at the Chandrasekhar mass*, as *carbon is ignited at the WD center*. Off-center ignition of helium at sub-Chandrasekhar masses may still be responsible for a subset of the SNe Ia which are subluminal, but this is less clear.

(3) The immediate progenitor systems are still not known with certainty. From the discussion in §5 (see in particular §5.1.3 and 5.2.3) however, I conclude that presently *single degenerate scenarios look more promising*, with hydrogen or helium rich material being transferred from a subgiant or giant companion (systems like Supersoft X-Ray Sources and Symbiotics).

(4) Definitive answers concerning the nature of the progenitors can be obtained from observations taken as early as possible in: *x-rays, radio, and high resolution optical spectroscopy*. *The establishment of the presence or absence of hydrogen in SNe Ia should be regarded as an extremely high priority goal for supernovae observers*. If hydrogen will not be detected at interesting limits (corresponding to $\dot{M}/v_{10} \sim 10^{-8} \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), this will point clearly towards the double-degenerate scenario.

(5) Observations of SNe Ia at high redshifts can help to test particular ingredients of the models which are directly related to the nature of the progenitors. For example, most of the models aiming at improving the statistics of the single-degenerate scenarios rely on a strong wind from the accreting WD. These models thus predict an “inhibition” of SNe Ia in low-metallicity environments, and in particular a significant decrease in the rate of SNe Ia at $z \sim 1-2$ (Kobayashi et al. 1998). At present, the detection of a very likely SN Ia at redshift $z = 1.32$ (SN 1997ff) in the Hubble Deep Field appears inconsistent with this prediction (Gilliland, Nugent & Phillips 1999), but more observations will be required to give a more definitive answer.

This research has been supported in part by NASA Grant NAG5-6857.

REFERENCES

- BACKER, D. C. 1993 In *ASP. Conf. Ser. 36* (ed. J. A. Phillips et al.). Planets around Pulsars, p. 11. ASP.
- BALBUS, S. A. & HAWLEY, J. F. 1998 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 1.
- BALBUS, S. A., HAWLEY, J. F. & STONE, J. M. 1996 *ApJ* **467**, 76.
- BARTUNOV, O. S., TSVETKOV, D. YU & FILIMONOVA, I. V. 1994 *PASP* **106**, 1276.
- BENZ, W., CAMERON, A. G. W., BOWERS, R. L., PRESS, W. H. 1990 *ApJ* **348**, 647.
- BOESGAARD, A. M., KING, J. R., DELIGANNIS, C. P. & VOGT, S. S. 1999 *AJ*, in press.
- BOFFI, F. R. & BRANCH, D. 1995 *PASP* **107**, 347.
- BRANCH, D. 1998 *ARAA* **36**, 17.
- BRANCH, D. & VAN DEN BERGH, S. 1993 *AJ* **105**, 2231.
- BRAVO, E. & GARCIA-SENZ, D. 1999, *MNRAS*, submitted.
- CANAL, R. 1997. In *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (eds. P. Ruiz-Lapuente, R. Canal & J. Isern). p 257. Kluwer.
- CANAL, R., ISERN, J. & LABAY, J. 1990 *ARAA* **28**, 183.
- CASSISI, S., IBEN, I. JR. & TORNANBE, A. 1998 *ApJ* **496**, 376.
- CHEVALIER, R. A. 1984 *ApJ* **285**, L63.
- CHUGAI, N. N. 1986 *SvA* **30**, 563.
- CUMMING, R. J., LUNDQVIST, P., SMITH, L. J., PETTINI, M. & KING, D. L. 1996 *MNRAS* **283**, 1355.
- DELLA VALLE, M., BENETTI, S. & PANAGIA, N. 1996 *ApJ* **459**, 23.
- DELLA VALLE, M. & LIVIO, M. 1994 *ApJ* **423**, L31.
- DI STEFANO, R., NELSON, L. A., LEE, W., WOOD, T. H. & RAPPAPORT, S. 1997. In *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (ed. R. Ruiz-Lapuente, R. Canal, & J. Isern). p. 147. Kluwer.
- DI STEFANO, R. & RAPPAPORT, S. 1994 *ApJ* **437**, 733.
- DOMINGUEZ, I., TORNAMBÉ, A. & ISERN, J. 1993 *ApJ* **419**, 268.
- ECK, C., COWAN, J. J., ROBERTS, D., BOFFI, F. R. & BRANCH, D. 1995 *ApJ* **451**, L53.
- EDVARDSSON, B., ANDERSEN, J., GUSTOFSSON, B., LAMBERT, D. L., NISSEN, P. E. & TOMKIN, J. 1993 *A&A* **275**, 101.
- FILIPPENKO, A. V. 1997 *ARAA* **35**, 309.
- FRANSSON, C., LUNDQVIST, P. & CHEVALIER, R. A. 1996 *ApJ* **461**, 993.
- GARCIA-SENZ, D., BRAVO, E., & SERICHOL, N. 1998 *ApJS* **115**, 119
- GILLILAND, R. I., NUGENT, P. E. & PHILLIPS, M. M. 1999 *ApJ*, in press.
- GÓMEZ, G., LÓPEZ, R. & SÁNCHEZ, F. 1996 *AJ* **112**, 2094.
- GREINER, J., HASINGER, G. & KAHABKA, P. 1991 *A&A* **246**, L17.
- GUTIÉRREZ, J., GARCIA-BERRO, E., IBEN, I. JR., ISERN, J., LABAY, J. & CANAL, R. 1996 *ApJ* **459**, 701.
- HACHISU, I., KATO, M. & NOMOTO, K. 1999, *ApJ*, in press, astro-ph/9902304.
- HACHISU, I., KATO, M., NOMOTO, K. & UMEDA, H. 1999 *ApJ*, in press, astro-ph/9902303.
- HAMUY, M., PHILLIPS, M. M., SUNTZEFF, N. B., SCHOMMER, R. A. MAZA, J. & AVILÉS, R. 1996a *AJ* **112**, 2398.
- HAMUY, M., PHILLIPS, M. M., SUNTZEFF, N. B., SCHOMMER, R. A., MAZA, J., ET AL. 1996b *AJ* **112**, 2438.
- HAUSCHILDT, P. H., BARON, E., STARRFIELD, S. & ALLARD, F. 1996 *ApJ* **462**, 386.
- HAUSCHILDT, P. H., STARRFIELD, S., SHORE, S. N., ALLARD, F. & BARON, E. 1995 *ApJ* **447**, 829.
- HOEFELICH, P. & KHOKHLOV, A. 1996 *ApJ* **457**, 500.
- IBEN, I. JR. & LIVIO, M. 1993 *PASP* **105**, 1373.

- IBEN, I. JR. & TUTUKOV, A. V. 1984 *ApJS* **54**, 355.
- IBEN, I. JR. & TUTUKOV, A. V. 1985 *ApJS* **58**, 661.
- KAHABKA, P. & VAN DEN HEUVEL, E. P. J. 1997 *ARA&A* **35**, 69.
- KATO, M. 1990 *ApJ* **355**, 277.
- KATO, M. 1991 *ApJ* **369**, 471.
- KATO, M. & HACHISU, I. 1999 *ApJ*, submitted, astro-ph/991080.
- KAUFFMANN, G., WHITE, S. D. M. & GUIDERDONI, B. 1993 *MNRAS* **264**, 201.
- KAWAI, Y., SAIO, H. & NOMOTO, K. 1987 *ApJ* **315**, 229.
- KENYON, S. J., LIVIO, M., MIKOLAJEWSKI, J. & TOUT, C. A. 1993 *ApJ* **407**, L81.
- KIRSHNER, R. P. ET AL. 1993 *ApJ* **415**, 589.
- KHOKHLOV, A. M., ORAN, E. S. & WHEELER, I. C. 1997 *ApJ* **478**, 678.
- KOBAYASHI, C., TSUJIMATO, T., NOMOTO, K., HACHISU, I. & KATO, M. 1998 *ApJ* **503**, L155.
- KOEN, C., OROSZ, J. A. & WADE, R. A. 1998 *MNRAS* **300**, 695.
- LI, X.-D. & VAN DEN HEUVEL, E. P. J. 1997 *A&A* **322**, L9.
- LIU, W., JEFFREY, D. D. & SCHULTZ, D. R. 1998 *ApJ* **494**, 812.
- LIVIO, M. 1995, In *Millisecond Pulsars: A Decade of Surprise* (eds. A. S. Fruchter, M. Tavani & D. R. Backer) volume 72, p. 105. ASP.
- LIVIO, M. 1996a, In *Supersoft X-Ray Sources* (ed. G. Greiner) p. 183. Springer.
- LIVIO, M. 1996b, In *Evolutionary Processes in Binary Stars* (eds. R. A. M. J. Wijers, M. B. Davies & C. A. Tout) p. 141. Kluwer.
- LIVIO, M., PRINGLE, J. E. & SAFFER, R. A. 1992 *MNRAS* **257**, 15p.
- LIVIO, M. & TRURAN, J. W. 1992 *ApJ* **389**, 695.
- LIVNE, E. 1990 *ApJ* **354**, L53.
- LIVNE, E. & ARNETT, D. 1995 *ApJ* **454**, 62.
- LIVNE, E. & GLASNER, A. 1991 *ApJ* **370**, 272.
- LIVNE, E., TUCHMAN, Y. & WHEELER, J. C. 1992, *ApJ* **399**, 665.
- MADAU, P., DELLA VALLE, M. & PANAGIA, N. 1998 *MNRAS* **297**, L17.
- MATTEUCCI, F. & GREGGIO, L. 1986 *A&A* **154**, 279.
- MINKOWSKI, R. 1939 *ApJ* **89**, 156.
- MOCHKOVITCH, R., GUERRERO, J. & SEGRETAIN, L. 1997 In *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (eds. P. Ruiz-Laguerre, R. Canal & J. Isern). p 187. Kluwer.
- MOCHKOVITCH, R. & LIVIO, M. 1990 *A&A* **236**, 378.
- MUNARI, V. & RENZINI, A. 1992 *ApJ* **397**, L87.
- NAGATAKI, S., HASHIMOTO, M. & SATO, K. 1998 *PSAJ* **50**, 75.
- NISSEN, P. E., GUSTAFSSON, G., EDVARDSSON, B. & GILMORE, G. 1994 *A&A* **285**, 440.
- NOMOTO, K. 1982 *ApJ* **253**, 798.
- NOMOTO, K., IWAMOTO, K., NAKASATO, N., THIELEMANN, F.-K., BRACHWITZ, F., TSUJIMOTO, T., KUBO, Y. & KISHIMOTO, N. 1997 *Nuc. Phys.* **A621**, 467c.
- NOMOTO, K. & KONDO, Y. 1991 *ApJ* **367**, L19.
- NOMOTO, K. & SUGIMOTO, D. 1977 *PASJ* **29**, 765.
- NUGENT, P., BARON, E., BRANCH, D., FISHER, A. & HAUSCHILD, P. H. 1997 *ApJ* **485**, 812.
- PERLMUTTER, S. ET AL. 1997 *ApJ* **483**, 565.
- PERLMUTTER, S. ET AL. 1998 astro-ph/9812473.
- PERLMUTTER, S. ET AL. 1999 *ApJ*, in press, astro-ph/9812133.
- PODSIADLOWSKI, PH., PRINGLE, J. E. & REES, M. J. 1991 *Nature* **352**, 783.
- POLCARO, V. F. & VIOTTI, R. 1991 *A&A* **242**, L9.
- PRIALNIK, D. & KOVETZ, A. 1995 *ApJ* **445**, 789.

- RASIO, F. A. & SHAPIRO, S. L. 1995, *ApJ* **438**, 887.
- REINECKE, M., HILLEBRANDT, W. & NIEMEYER, J. C. 1998 *A&A*, in press, astro-ph/9812120.
- RENZINI, A. 1996 In *Supernovae and Supernova Remnants* (ed. R. McCray & Z. Wang). p 77. CUP.
- RIESS, A. G., NUGENT, P., FILIPPENKO, A. V., KIRSHNER, R. P. & PERLMUTTER, S. 1998 *ApJ* **504**, 935.
- RIESS, A. G. ET AL. 1998 *AJ* **116**, 1009.
- RIESS, A. G., PRESS, W. H. & KIRSHNER, R. P. 1996 *ApJ* **473**, 88.
- RITOSSA, C., GARCIA-BERRO, E. & IBEN, I. JR. 1996 *ApJ* **460**, 489.
- RUIZ-LAPUENTE, P. & CANAL, R. 1998 *ApJ* **497**, L57.
- RUIZ-LAPUENTE, P., CANAL, R. & BURKERT, A. 1997. In *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (ed. R. Ruiz-Lapuente, R. Canal, & J. Isern). p. 205. Kluwer.
- RUIZ-LAPUENTE, P., KIRSHNER, R. P., PHILLIPS, M. M., CHALLIS, P. M., SCHMIDT, B. P., FILIPPENKO, A. V. & WHEELER, J. C. 1995 *ApJ* **439**, 60.
- SAFFER, R. A., LIVIO, M. & YUNGELSON, L. R. 1998 *ApJ* **502**, 394.
- SAHA, A., SANDAGE, A., LABHARDT, L., TAMMANN, G. A., MACCHETTO, F. D. & PANAGIA, N. 1997 *ApJ* **486**, 1.
- SAIO, H. & NOMOTO, K. 1985 *A&A* **150**, L21.
- SAIO, H. & NOMOTO, K. 1998 *ApJ* **500**, 388.
- SANDAGE, A., SAHA, A., TAMMANN, G. A., LABHARDT, L., PANAGIA, N. & MACCHETTO, F. D. 1996 *ApJ* **460**, L15.
- SCHLEGEL, E. M. 1995 *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **58**, 1375.
- SCHMIDT, B. ET AL. 1998 *ApJ* **507**, 46.
- SOUTHWELL, K. A., LIVIO, M., CHARLES, P. A., O'DONOGHUE, D. & SUTHERLAND, W. J. 1996 *ApJ* **470**, 1065.
- TAMMAN, G. A. & SANDAGE, A. 1995 *ApJ* **452**, 16.
- THORSETT, S. E., ARZOWMANIAN, Z. & TAYLOR, J. H. 1993 *ApJ* **412**, L33.
- TIMMES, F. X., WOOSLEY, S. E. & TAAM, R. E. 1994 *ApJ* **420**, 348.
- TURATTO, M., CAPPELLARO, E. & BENETTI, S. 1994 *AJ* **108**, 202.
- VAUGHAN, T. E., BRANCH, D., MILLER, D. L. & PERLMUTTER, S. 1995 *ApJ* **439**, 558.
- WEBBINK, R. F. 1984 *ApJ* **227**, 355.
- WHEELER, J. C., HARKNESS, R. P., KHOKHLOV, A. V. & HOEFELICH, P. 1995 *Phys. Rep.* **256**, 211.
- WHELAN, J. & IBEN, I. JR. 1973 *ApJ* **186**, 1007.
- WOLSZCZAN, A. 1997 *Cel. Mech. & Dyn. Aston.* **68**, 13.
- WOOSLEY, S. E. 1997 In *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (eds. P. Ruiz-Lapuente, R. Canal & J. Isern). p 313. Kluwer.
- WOOSLEY, S. E., TAAM, R. E. & WEAVER, T. A. 1986 *ApJ* **301**, 601.
- WOOSLEY, S. E. & WEAVER, T. A. 1994 *ApJ* **423**, 371.
- VAN DEN HEUVEL, E. P. J., BHATTACHARYA, D., NOMOTO, K. & RAPPAPORT, S. A. 1992 *A&A* **262**, 97.
- VERMEULEN, R. C. ET AL. 1992 *A&A* **270**, 204.
- YUNGELSON, L. & LIVIO, M. 1998 *ApJ* **497**, 168.
- YUNGELSON, L. R. & LIVIO, M. 1999, in preparation.
- YUNGELSON, L., LIVIO, M., TRURAN, J. W., TUTUKOV, A. & FEDOROVA, A. V. 1996 *ApJ* **466**, 890.
- YUNGELSON, L., LIVIO, M., TUTUKOV, A. & KENYON, S. J. 1995 *ApJ* **447**, 656.